

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 2, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 9, 14, 20. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over EP 0843249 to Helmut. Applicants have reviewed this reference in detail and do not believe that it discloses or makes obvious the invention as claimed.

The device shown in Helmut works in a different manner and yields different results than the present invention as described by the amended claims. The cryptographic unit (CU) provides a set of services to the host system (p. 11, lines 21-24). For an application to use the CU, the application must first be installed. A certified application includes an application image 29 and a certificate 28 from the ADA (application domain authority). The certificate includes application ID 137 and a class of service 136 defined for the application. Using these two elements, the CU produces a “credential” 130 which identifies the application (a name or a hash value of the application image) and the class of service defined by the application (p. 13, lines 39-51). The credential is signed by the CU (application signature 138). Assuming that the application signature identifies the particular CU, which is certainly not clear from the Helmut specification, the only certificate that could bind the particular CU with the application is the credential 130. Hence, under this assumption, the application is bound to the particular CU, by the CU itself.

The purpose of the credential is to ensure that an application has authority to access a CU and that it is not modified during operation. The authority to access a CU appears to extend to all CUs, not any particular CU.

The present invention performs an entirely different function. Only firmware (or, alternatively, application software or data) approved by the manufacturer can be used to control the computing device and the firmware cannot be replaced or modified by someone other than the manufacturer. This prevents alteration of the operation of the computing device by third party modifications (i.e., viruses) or by user changes to the device's intended settings.

In the Helmut device, the application software is not initially bound to a particular CU – the binding, if it occurs at all, is generated by the CU itself. The only result of the binding is that, once installation occurs, the application cannot be changed. But there is no disclosure in Helmut that the same certified application could not be used with another host and CU.

In the present invention, the certificate that binds the application and the particular computing device is generated by the manufacturer – not by the computing device itself. Hence, the application will run on one, and only one, computing device. The user of the particular computing device could not copy the software and use it on another compatible computing device, because the application is bound to a single computing device.

Since this aspect of the invention is not shown in Helmut, Applicants respectfully request allowance of independent claims 1 and 14. Further, Applicants request allowance of dependent claims 2-11 and 15-21.

An extension of one month is requested and a Request for Extension of Time under § 1.136 with the appropriate fee is attached hereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Alan W. Lintel/

Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

August 2, 2007
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595